



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,933	11/20/2006	Patricia A. Riley	61284-0006	5408
24115	7590	02/27/2009	EXAMINER	
BUCKINGHAM, DOOLITTLE & BURROUGHS, LLP			DAVIS, DEBORAH A	
3800 EMBASSY PARKWAY				
SUITE 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AKRON, OH 44333-8332			1655	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/27/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPDOCKETAKRON@BDBLAW.COM  
MMiller2@BDBLAW.COM  
DHrina@BDBLAW.COM

<i>Office Action Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/573,933	RILEY, PATRICIA A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DEBORAH A. DAVIS	1655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response to the Office Action mailed on May 20, 2008 has been acknowledged. Currently, claims 1-15 are pending and under consideration for examination.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patricia A. Riley (5,925,348) *stand rejected for reasons of record and restated below:*

The reference of Riley beneficially teaches the instant claims by disclosing therapeutic topical compositions of Sacred Lotus Seed, that comprise methyltransferase in suitable carriers or vehicles that include gels, creams, lotions and powders (column 3, lines 10-18, e.g.) for treatment of aging skin (column 2, lines 44-51, e.g.). Other sources of methyltransferase that may be used include extracts of Yellow Lotus plants and seeds (*Nelumbo lutea*), which would include the flower portion of the plant (column 4, lines 21-25, e.g.). The composition of Sacred Lotus may also contain additional antioxidants, minerals and hormones (column 5, lines 46-60, e.g.) and amino acids such as Aspartyl residues (Table 5, e.g.) or cysteine (Example 7, e.g.). Methyl donors of the cited composition include lecithin, as claimed (column 6, lines 17-23, e.g.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prepare a therapeutic Sacred Lotus Seed extract composition based upon the beneficial teachings provided by the cited reference, as discussed above. The adjustment of particular conventional working conditions is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

From the teachings of the reference, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the reference, especially in the absence of the evidence to the contrary.

#### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed November 18, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive of error.

Applicant argues that the cited reference of Patricia Riley would not motivate one skilled in the art to make the applicant's combination in independent claims 1 or 2 because there is only a general teaching of the active ingredients provided by the reference. Applicant further argues that the compositions taught by Riley include an additional 33 components that could result in thousands of possible combinations that could result in years of experimentation and not routine experimentation. Applicant argues that the KSR ruling provides for a broader approach to obviousness not

restricting analysis to the teaching, suggest or motivate test. These arguments have been fully considered but not found to be persuasive of error.

In response, the claims recite open “comprising” language and therefore is not prohibited from including other ingredients taught by the prior art reference of Riley. The reference of Riley teaches that the composition is topical and also recites the required active ingredients as required by the claims. The composition taught by Riley is for the treatment of aging skin and applicant's specification teaches the same purpose. Thus, applicant's combination composition is included within the composition taught by Riley. Therefore, with respect to the KSR ruling, the examiner has made the appropriate rejection against the instant claims allowed within the guidelines of the KSRs. Therefore, the rejection is deemed obvious over the instant claims and therefore proper, and is hereby maintained and made final.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

*Conclusion*

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBORAH A. DAVIS whose telephone number is (571)272-0818. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Deborah A. Davis  
Patent Examiner, AU 1655  
February 2009

/Christopher R. Tate/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655